

VOLUME 8.

NUMBER 2

PRICE 1/-

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for February, 1967

CATHOLICISM CONFRONTS THE WORLD	<i>Edward Duff, S.J.</i>
INTELLECTUALS AND RADICAL REFORM	<i>The Editor</i>
AUSTRALIAN OUTLOOK	<i>B. A. Santamaria</i>
CREDO	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
PHILOSOPHY WITH COMPASSION	<i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
THE TWO WORLDS	<i>E. L. Way</i>

Contents

Page

65 A POPE AND A WAR

The Editor

67 CATHOLICISM CONFRONTS THE
WORLD.

Edward Duff, S.J.

80 CURRENT COMMENT: LETTERS TO
THE CATHOLIC LEFT: 1 INTEL-
LECTUALS AND RADICAL REFORM

The Editor

92 THE TWO WORLDS

E. L. Way

97 AUSTRALIAN OUTLOOK: 2 THE
ALTERNATIVES

B. A. Santamaria

113 INDUSTRIAL ANGLE: CREDO

J. M. Jackson

120 THE CHURCH AT WORK: LOVE IN
ACTION: 3 CREDIT UNIONS IN
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

J. Van den Dries

126 BOOK REVIEW

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Funnival St., London EC4 and 3 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Emmet Road, Bray.

Annual subscription: on year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 8.

FEBRUARY, 1967

NUMBER 2.

A POPE and A WAR

THE EDITOR

OBJECTIVE historical investigation is one thing. There can never be enough of it. Chipping away at a great man's reputation is quite another. Pius XII at present is the subject of both operations. I have no quarrel with the first. Why, one asks, does the second occur?

Sometimes, I think, it is part of an old and oft-repeated story. The Papacy, after all, is a standing rebuke to the futility of self-sufficient men who try to do without God. They would like to take it down a peg or two if they could and prove it a failure in some respect, if only to compensate thereby for their own frequent failings. It was young Mgr. Pacelli who handed to the representative of the German Government, during the first World War, the fifteen peace points of Pope Benedict XV. The warring governments rejected them. Had they listened to the Pope, the slaughter would have ceased; there might well have been no Hitler; the world today might be a very different place. The Secret Treaty of London which, in 1915, brought Italy into the war on the side of the Allies, excluded the Pope from the peace and the Papacy from the League of Nations. The world wanted neither.

The man-made peace collapsed and the world went to war again in 1939 over the prostrate body of the League from which the Vicar of Christ on earth had been excluded. Could it be that the present prejudiced assault on the memory of the war-time Pope represents no more than the

subconscious attempt of a secularist world to get even with God in compensation for the suffering it knows in its heart its rejection of its Maker has brought on itself? This, after all, is how children behave, and we are all children of God. If men have failed, the self-sufficiency, which is the real cause of their failure, may well seek satisfaction in an endeavour, in a roundabout, twisted way, to pin failure on the Pope. Thereby they "prove" how right they were, and still are, to reject his counsel. They can go on doing this now. Secularism can stay. Men can still keep off their knees. The present need is not for prayer, but continued scientific investigation. The analysis may be somewhat far-fetched. I think, nevertheless, there is something in it.

There is another angle. The concern of the liberal progressive has always been with theories rather than people. His method is that of protest irrespective of the consequences. He derives immense satisfaction from denunciation, no matter how many, thereby, are made to suffer. Could it be that the conscience of secular liberalism, burdened now more than ever before with a rash of denunciations quite empty of result, is seeking—again in its self-sufficiency—to justify the emptiness through denunciation of the highest authority in Christendom for not having denounced as it would have done itself in circumstances of similar frightfulness? It is quite true that, instead of denouncing Hitler for exterminating the Jews, Pope Pius XII set about the task of saving as many as he could from Hitler's clutches. In this, he was quietly successful. I hate to think what the consequences of a progressive policy of denunciation would have been under similar circumstances. The present Holy Father, Paul VI, is emphatic in this point. They would have been frightful. Is not the liberal knowledge of this—of the futility of their policy of denunciation then and now—the driving force behind their indictment of a man who, as Vicar of Christ on earth, showed not by empty talk, but by quiet and effective doing, the futility of their ways. The trouble with Pius XII is that he was right. Liberal progressives refuse to admit it. That is why they cannot leave his memory alone.

In this penetrating article, a distinguished American Jesuit journalist examines the last of the great documents of the Second Vatican Council, that dealing with the Church in the modern world.

Catholicism Confronts the World

EDWARD DUFF, S.J.

WITH the death of Pope John on June 3, 1963, there was much curiosity and in some quarters uneasiness as to the future of the *aggiornamento*, the movement of reform, renewal and updating in Roman Catholicism he had initiated and which the Second Vatican Council had come to symbolise. True, his successor-to-be, Archbishop Giovanni Battista Montini of Milan in a eulogy had declared: "Death cannot stifle the spirit which he has infused into our era. Can we turn away from the paths he so masterfully traced? It seems to me that we cannot". The new Pope's first encyclical letter was, in deference to the Council he had promptly reconvened, not a formal doctrinal pronouncement nor a concrete programme of action but an unexpectedly personalised causerie on the need for dialogue, indicating an anguished awareness of the distances separating men. Speaking to the crowd gathered in St. Peter's Square, to recite the Angelus with him, on Sunday before the opening of the second session of the Council, Pope Paul VI called for prayers that the Church "can resume the necessary contact with the world," a clear implication that such contact had been broken. "The world has changed and entrenches itself in forms autonomous of and diffident toward religion," the new pontiff observed. "We must enter into contact to render it service for its salvation, its prosperity and its peace."

Enough for Twenty Years of Debate

This emphasis on the Church's responsibility to the world and its mission of service to men was an echo of a suggestion that Cardinal Montini had endorsed in the closing days of the first session of the Council. It was, after immense effort, to find formal expression in the Pastoral Constitution *The Church in the Modern World*, the last of the Council documents. Paging today through the four Constitutions, nine Decrees and three Declarations of Vatican II, the formulation on specific topics of 6,000 oral or written interventions of nearly 2,500 bishops from all corners of the world through four sessions lasting from October 14, 1962, to December 7, 1965, it is difficult to recall how general were its announced purposes, how vague its original expectations. The preparatory process produced documents supporting more than 70 agenda items, presaging, if all were presented for explicit consideration, twenty years of debate.

Two Questions

As the first session neared its close without a single topic completed, Cardinal Suenens of Belgium rose to suggest that the entire scope of the Council could be reduced to two questions. First, what does the Church conceive herself to be. And second, what is her role in the contemporary world. In answer to the first question, in *Lumen Gentium*, the Church was seen to be more than an organisation of like-minded people subject to a common authority. It was immensely more than an association whose characteristics can be set out in the manner of a prospectus of a stock-offering of an established corporation. The Council declared that the Church is a mystery involving the relations of the Holy Trinity to the created world, the mystery of the effects of an Incarnation whereby the Word of God wed mankind in taking flesh of a Jewish girl 2,000 years ago. The Church, then, is this renewed humanity, the People of God, each of equal dignity, some set apart for a special ministry of service, but all responsible for the conduct of the march and the redemption of the world.

But how is this people of God to conduct itself in its

pilgrimage? What precisely is the role of the Church in the contemporary world? The difficulties in elaborating an anyway adequate answer occupied a commission of the Council through three sessions. They proved to be both theological and historical. And arose from the total Christian affirmation about man and his destiny as well as from the experience of the Catholic Church in recent centuries.

Man's Dual Destiny

The Christian knows by faith that there is an existence awaiting him beyond death, the terms of which will be proportioned to the quality of his living here. He knows that he can be diverted from his essential goal, which is truly a matter of everlasting life or death, by egoism, greed, lust, hate, by temptations found in the world. He has heard Jesus announce that his "kingdom is not of this world" and remembers that Jesus would not pray for "this world". The theme of much pulpit oratory has been that here we have no abiding city. On the other hand, scripture assures the Christian that God looked upon his creation and found it "good", that He "so loved the world as to send his only-begotten Son". Moreover from the beginning man was commanded to take possession of the earth, subdue it and complete the creative work of God in constructing from material things, shaped by human intelligence, a civilisation that would be human, fraternal, just and peaceful. Indeed, love and the service of our fellow-men were made the measure of our love and service of God. So there is no escaping the essential theological tension deriving from man's double destiny. The world is to be taken seriously but it cannot become an object of idolatry. Nothing, not the sublimest human goal, can be made an ultimate end in itself. Social justice must be striven for but the prayer of adoration must not be neglected. Christianity must not be subverted into an ideology with religion narrowly conceived as an instrument of social reform. On the other hand, the social implications of Christianity must not be abolished by a withdrawal from

the world: a world looked upon as an arena of selfishness and sin, self-condemned because of its secular concerns.

Niebuhr's Brilliant Description

Richard Niebuhr expressed this essential tension between the incarnational and eschatological dimensions of Christianity brilliantly twenty years ago: "How to be in the world and yet not of the world has always been the problem of the church. It is a revolutionary community in a pre-revolutionary society. Its main task always remains that of understanding, proclaiming and preparing for the divine revolution in human life. Nevertheless, there remains the necessity of participation in the affairs of an unconverted an unreborn world. Hence the church's strategy always has a dual character and the dualism is in constant danger of being resolved into a monism of other-worldliness or of this-worldliness, into a more or less quiescent expectancy of a revolution beyond time or of a mere reform programme carried out in terms of the existent order" (*The Church Against the World*, Chicago, Willet, Clarke, 1935, p.115).

The present Pope, when Cardinal Montini, endeavoured to phrase the ideal relation of the sacral and temporal orders in an address to the Congress of the Lay Apostolate in 1957: "The Church's mission is to establish contact between the sacred and the profane in such a way that the former is not contaminated but communicated and the latter is not distorted but sanctified". It is apt to recall here that it was found necessary at the World Council of Churches' Second Assembly at Evanston in 1954 to have two speakers, Professors Richard Calhoun of Yale and Edmund Schlink of Heidelberg, address themselves to the main theme: *Christ—the Hope of the World* so that the two emphases reflecting the double destiny of man should not be neglected.

In elaborating the Constitution on *The Church in the Modern World*, the process of relating the sacred to the profane was also complicated by the social and philosophical revolutions of the last three centuries, especially those of Europe. While these movements politically liberated man, they often attacked religion itself as the source of his

servitude. It was central to Marx's analysis that religion is the root of man's alienation from his true possibilities: that it is a deplorable distraction from the common task of building a more just society. Much of modern history has shunted the Church aside. And has confined religion to the sphere of the personal, and often only the emotional side of man. The French historian Michelet explained that "the revolution has no need of a church because it was its own church".

Sharing the Confusion

Under assault by these aggressive and multiple forces, Catholicism was forced into, or opted for, a posture of rejection, reproof, and retreat. This defensive mentality infected spiritual teaching as well. Confusion abounded as to the realm of "the world," so that one might well think that history and time, where personal salvation is wrought, were categories of small interest to the Christian for whom existence is merely a matter of accumulating pension rights to heaven. William Stringfellow has castigated this narrow, self-serving, soul-polishing spirituality with the damning phrase "Christianity has to do with religion, not with life"! The historical situation was prone to produce the sceptical when not scandalised Christian spectator, more concerned with the usefulness of piety than the piety of usefulness. At any rate it was not a situation calculated to foster a theological tradition familiar with the issues the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World proposed to discuss.

It is true that the Catholic community has for more than two generations received in the form of papal encyclicals analyses of contemporary social injustices accompanied by strong injunctions to redress them. Is it, partly, because of the lack of a carefully elaborated coherent theology of man's role in the world that these directives and exhortations had such small influence? A prominent priest-sociologist, Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., has written: "Catholics share in the anti-Semitism of the Northeast, in the isolationism of the Midwest, in the prejudices against Mexicans in the Southwest. Catholics acted like Californians when the

Japanese-Americans were dispossessed and sent to relocation camps, like Texans when the off-shore oil disputes were discussed and like Ciceronians when Negro families moved into white neighbourhoods in Illinois. On this level we are dealing with moral and social problems on which the American people are confused, and on which Catholics demonstrate their achieved Americanisation by sharing the confusion" (*Roman Catholicism and the American Way of Life*, edited by Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., University of Notre Dame Press, 1960, p.124).

Christ in History

To a large extent, then, the project broke new ground. What systematic investigations had been done in what the French call the Theology of Terrestrial Realities were employed in elaborating the document known successively as Schema 17 and Schema 13 and promulgated as the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. It is a 30,000 word analysis of the total Christian conception of man and of his contemporary responsibilities. The early Church had to challenge and condemn the errors of Docetism. This was the heresy which maintained that Christ had merely appeared to be human but that, being God, could not have had a real physical body which sweated and laughed and slept and suffered. In the Constitution on the Church having shown the relation of the Christian community to Christ, the Council would now explain how Christ's work perdures in history, perpetuated in his people who are the Church. It would not be content with specifying—much less contemplating—the leaven Christ asserted his Church to be but would describe how the leaven should function in the dough of today.

A Generation's Moral Problems

In structure the document is divided into two parts, the second being a consideration of "some more urgent problems" confronting mankind today. These problems are grouped into five categories: the dignity of marriage and the family, the advancement of culture, economic-social life, the

life of the political community, and the community of nations, and the building up of peace. Popular interest in Rome and elsewhere centred almost exclusively on what the Council would say on these issues; one would have thought that the bishops had been summoned primarily to supply answers to the questions of "the pill" and "the bomb". But, whatever the worth of the analyses and recommendations of this part of the Constitution (and a new intellectual modesty underlined the protestation that the Church does not have ready answers to all history's contingencies), they are in the nature of things an examination of *this* generation's moral quandaries and challenges. Of permanent importance, on the other hand, is the first part of the document. It supplies a steady perspective of the essential Christian vocation and a basis for the spirituality that will orient and motivate the Christian of any era and any culture endeavouring to play his proper role in the world. Does involvement here import contamination? Scarcely, since what is at issue is a proper attitude towards the environment in which by God's choice the Christian is situated. For the explanation of the presence and activity of the Church "the council focuses its attention on the world of men the whole human family along with the sum of those realities in the midst of which it lives; that world which is the theatre of man's history and the heir of his energies, his tragedies and his triumphs; that world which the Christian sees as created and sustained by its Maker's love, fallen indeed into the bondage of sin yet emancipated now by Christ, who was crucified and rose again to break the stranglehold of personified evil, so that the world might be fashioned anew according to God's design and reach its fulfilment".

A New Age

The Church then does not merely co-exist with the world. As the people of God, the Church is consubstantial with history as is Christ her head. In exploring her action and in defining her mission, the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World clarifies further the nature of the Church.

She is to be in the world, to be composed of men inescapably immersed in the tides and issues of the hour and responsible before God for the direction of history. The document is addressed to "the whole of humanity" to whom is offered "the assistance of the Church in fostering that brotherhood which corresponds to this destiny of theirs". A section supplies a brief historical and sociological background to "the joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age". It is noted that we are already in a new age of history with radical social and cultural transformations following on man's progressive mastering of his environment. Yet scandalous imbalances abound which produce "mutual mistrust, enmities, conflicts and hardships" of which man is "simultaneously the cause and the victim". A global process of liberation and of interdependence, at once promising and menacing, marks our era. However, none of these triumphs, none of these aspirations solve the deep mystery of man to which Christ alone is the key. Part 1 of the Constitution analyses "The Church and Man's Calling" through four chapters which answer such questions as: What is Man? What is to be done for the construction of a more fraternal society? How should the people of God conduct itself in its pilgrimage through time?

Man Split Within Himself

Both Catholic bishops and Observer-Delegates found an earlier draft of Chapter 1, "The Dignity of the Human Person," tinged with Pelagianism. While relatively optimistic in its picture of the creature sharing "the light of the divine mind" and affirmative in its endorsement of the contemporary pursuit of freedom, the revised version notes that man is "split within himself," sin diminishing him and blocking his path to fulfilment. Man's call to communion with God is listed as "the root reason" for his essential dignity, a truth that occasioned an extended consideration of the phenomenon of contemporary atheism whose causes, it was observed, are multiple and include the failure of believers. It was at this point that a conservative bloc in the Council clamoured for a new and formal condemnation

of Communism. They had to be satisfied with references to the encyclicals of Popes Pius XII, John XXIII, and Paul VI and the assertion that the Christian life, fully and authentically lived, is the indicated answer and tactic. Moreover, while wholly rejecting atheism, the Council summoned all men to a common effort to better the world in which they live.

"Socialisation"

Chapter 2, "The Community of Mankind" points to the increasing interdependence and multiplication of reciprocal ties among men, giving rise to a variety of associations and organisations both private and public. The development has been called "socialisation" in the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* where the phenomenon was praised as making available on a larger scale to more people the possibilities of a truly human existence. But central to all improvements in the social order is a reverence for men (even those opposed to us), a greater recognition of the basic equality of all (women not least) and a larger consciousness of personal responsibility for the common welfare. In Chapter 3 the meaning of work is theologically explored. It is seen as the fulfilment of the divine mandate to subject creation to humanly profitable ends. "Thus, far from thinking that works produced by man's own talent and energy are in opposition to God's power and that the rational creature exists as a kind of rival to the Creator, Christians are convinced that the triumphs of the human race are a sign of God's grace and the flowering of his own mysterious design." Moreover, while all things depend upon God and must not be used against His purposes, earthly affairs have their own real if subordinate autonomy, enjoying "their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use and regulated by men". Increased power over creation brings, as Scripture warns, temptations and, indeed, today menaces the survival of the human race itself. Whence the reinforced importance of the Christian message that "all human activity, constantly imperilled by man's pride and deranged self-love, must be purified and perfected by the power of Christ's cross and resurrection".

Dignity of the Person

What then is "the Role of the Church in the Modern World"? While "Christ, to be sure, gave his Church no proper mission in the political, economic or social order," in disclosing to men the meaning of existence, the Church anchors the dignity of the person against all tides of opinion and supplies light and energy for the construction and consolidation of the human community. The Church's message of universal fraternity, moreover, fosters concern for the needy and supports all efforts towards unity among nations. This communication of the Christian vision, this penetration of the world by the Christian spirit is primarily a task of the layman. Nor is it optional: "The Christian who neglects his temporal duties neglects his duties towards his neighbour and even God, and jeopardises his eternal salvation". Yet the layman, as citizen of the world, is not to imagine that "his pastors are always such experts, that to every problem which arises, however complicated, they can readily give him a concrete solution or even that such is their mission". Given the complexity of contemporary problems and the diversity of means to a given goal, the solution offered by a Christian is not to be identified with the Christian message. Differences of opinion are to be respected and a willingness to work with those of other—or no—religious faiths for social progress manifested. On its side the world helps the Church, the voices of different cultures enabling her to penetrate more deeply and to express more clearly the revelation she is charged to communicate.

A Realistic Christian Anthropology

Any effort to summarise the rich and many-sided theology of Part 1 of the Constitution of the Church in the Modern World risks reducing to banalities and exhortations the extended effort to elaborate for the first time in Conciliar history a realistic Christian anthropology. What must be pointed out is the dependence of its exposition on the dogmatic enunciations of the *Constitution on the Church* promulgated in 1964. The present document, indeed, can be considered a supplement of the earlier one. Both have a common doctrinal

orientation, both are explicitly Christocentric in emphasis. Thus each of the chapters of the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World relates its theme to Christ as inspiring or confirming its argument. The dignity of the person is ultimately rooted in Christ who died for all men and who sent his Holy Spirit to enable men to discharge the new law of love. The community of mankind, it is explained, is a consequence of God calling all men to one and the same goal: Himself. It is consummated in the work of the very Word made flesh who shared our human fellowship. Again, human activity and earthly progress are not to be identified with Christ's kingdom and yet, to the extent that they contribute to the better ordering of human society, they are of vital concern to the Kingdom of God which is already present among us in mystery but which will be brought to full flower when the Lord returns. Finally, it is recalled by way of indicating the role of the Church in the world that "every benefit which the People of God during its earthly pilgrimage can offer to the human family stems from the fact that the Church is the universal sacrament of salvation, simultaneously manifesting and exercising the mystery of God's love for man".

Particularly Urgent Needs

The second half of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World examines "a number of particularly urgent needs characterising the present age, needs which go to the roots of the human race". The issues considered range from the family (with which "the well-being of the individual and of human and Christian society is intimately linked") through human progress, life in its economic, social and political dimensions, the bonds between nations, the fostering of peace and the promoting of a world community. The issues begin with the intimate union of man and woman, crucial to their personal perfection and holiness and the welfare of future citizens of the here and the hereafter and conclude with the tasks of giving institutional form to the universal human family. An inspection of these complex problems is beyond the space limitations of this article.

Appeal to Common Experience

It should be noted that the consideration of these areas of human involvement is made "in the light of the gospel and of human experience". It was inevitable that a document addressing itself "not only to the sons of the Church and to all who invoke the name of Christ but to the whole of humanity" would seek a widely accessible idiom. Moreover, Catholic social teaching has traditionally employed reason in its ethical analysis, often in the process losing a measure of the prophetic accent in its utterances. Perhaps in an effort to achieve a more universal mode of discourse, arguments appealing explicitly to the natural law were dropped in favour of invoking the wisdom imparted by man's common experience. Another key document of the Council makes the point: "The declarations of this Vatican Council on the right of man to religious liberty have their foundations in the dignity of the person, the implications of which, after centuries of experience, have become more and more apparent to human reason". To be sure, the larger and more central place that Scripture holds in contemporary Catholic theologizing shows itself in the biblical insights constantly supporting the Constitution's analyses. But problems besetting modern man do not have ready answers in Scripture alone, else the debate on the morality of war would long since have closed. A ringing condemnation of arms may provide emotional satisfaction but it does not directly influence the national self-righteousness which blunts the moral indignation needed to move resolutely toward the institutions of a world society where there will be no more room for wars, and order between nations will be assured as in local communities the citizenry is today protected against organised crime.

A New Spiritual Stance

A footnote to the title of the Constitution indicates that the two parts make an organic unity. The first deals with the doctrinal questions regarding man, the world, and man's relationship with his fellow-men. The second part concentrates on various aspects of modern life and human society.

While this latter subject matter is viewed in the light of doctrinal principles, it is, a footnote explains, made up of diverse elements. "Some elements have a permanent value; others only a transitory one." Consequently, interpreters must bear in mind—especially in part two—the changeable circumstances which the subject matter, by its very nature involves." What is offered here, then, are the reflections and counsel of the best thinking of the Roman Catholic Church on the burdens and challenges and orientations for making the world a more human habitation for God's children. It is the present writer's conviction that such a task has been immensely facilitated by the permanently valid theology of man's total vocation and complete destiny elaborated in the first part of the Constitution. The Preface to the document had asserted that "the human person deserves to be preserved, human society deserves to be renewed". The text proceeded to explain why in uncomplicated concepts and often moving prose. Over generations to come (since here the question of communications is crucial), the result will be a new spiritual stance, a recognition of common involvement, a new openness to others working for justice, a greater understanding that the mandate of continuing the work of Christ under the lead of the befriending Spirit. More important to answers to the bomb and the pill, the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World reminds all: "And Christ entered this world to give witness to the truth, to rescue and not to sit in judgment, to serve and not to be served".

Neither Christian nor Human

"The great weakness of the social order is that it is neither deeply Christian nor truly human but merely material and economic and that it does not rely on that which should be its basis and the solid foundation of its unity, i.e. the character common to men by nature and that of sons of God by divine adoption." Pope Pius XII, 31st January, 1952.

CURRENT COMMENT

The group of Catholics centered round *Slant* have been making an impact on the Catholic body in this country, particularly at undergraduate level. Father Paul Crane has been studying their social thinking as contained in their Manifesto and a book by Terry Eagleton called *The New Left Church*. Current Comment this month is devoted to what he hopes will be the first of a series of open letters in which he will comment on their ideas with regard to man and society.

Letters to the Catholic Left

1: Intellectuals and Radical Reform

THE EDITOR

GENTLEMEN,

I have read twice and with great care the two publications which contain your thoughts to date on the Church and society. I refer to Terry Eagleton's, *The New Left Church and Catholics and the Left*, otherwise known as the *Slant Manifesto*. I suppose I should add to this list Brian Wicker's *Culture and Theology*. Unfortunately, I have not read it as yet. Later on, I hope to do so. Neither am I a reader of *Slant* and *Blackfriars* in which your thinking is made available to the Catholic body as it unfolds. You must forgive me for this omission. Perhaps I shall be able to remedy it later on. Meanwhile, I propose to set down my thoughts on the two books of yours which I have read. I have given each of them two readings and made copious

notes on the way; a tiring business made necessary, no doubt, by my own dullness, but also, if I may say so, by the somewhat obscure style in which your thesis is presented. It is, surely, of the essence of a manifesto that it should be clear. I find this hardly the case with the two books I have read. Laying hold of their meaning at times has proved as easy as handling a wet and wriggling fish, the harder you grab at it the more likely it is to slip through your fingers. You are fair enough, indeed, to concede the complicated nature of the analysis you are attempting. At the same time, presumably, you want your manifesto to get across to your fellow-Catholics. Forgive me if I say that you do not appear to me to have been too successful in doing that.

On reflection, I believe that I can only attempt to do justice to your two books I have read if I treat them separately. This may involve some repetition. I ask your pardon for that. I shall begin with Terry Eagleton's *New Left Church*, which I have read with great interest. I have paid particular attention to the first essay and the last, for these appear to me to contain the basic essentials not only of his thinking, but of yours as a group. For this reason they deserve careful consideration from any sympathetic reader. I cannot be at all certain, therefore, that I will be able to say all I have to say about these two interesting essays in the space of one letter. I imagine it will take me several. If this proves to be the case, please take it as a sign of goodwill. If my letters are few and far between, please understand that the reason is the pressure of a rather fully occupied existence and nothing more.

Socialism and Christianity

"The aim of this book", Eagleton writes in his foreword, "isn't to convert agnostic politicians, but to persuade Christians that being in the Church involves commitment to imaginative culture and the political left". This is clear enough. So, too, I think, is the implication, that only a society made in the image of the political left can produce the kind of imaginative culture which, in Eagleton's view,

should embrace existing social relationships. The conclusion, expressed elsewhere in your writings, is that Christianity can be true to itself only when identified in the concrete with a socialist society. As a group, you make this quite plain. It is, so to say, your signature tune, the refrain that runs through your writing. I will come back to it later.

A Question of Authority

Here, at the outset of what I have to say, I am content to note that your advocacy of a socialist society as the only valid expression of Christianity is diametrically opposed to stated papal opinion from Leo XIII until Paul VI. This was put at its plainest by Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*, which was written in 1931. "No one," he wrote, "can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a socialist properly so called". I know of no papal statement before or since which reverses that decision. Without pushing the argument further at this stage, I think it fair to point out that your advocacy of a socialist society places you outside the ranks of those who think with the Church on this matter—not in servile fashion, but in this sense that, in their reflections on the shape society should take, they take as the departure point of their thinking, the often expressed and emphatic opinion of the highest authority in Christendom on the problem under consideration. Thereby they do no more than give it the respect which is, surely, its elementary due. This you do not appear to have done. You have dismissed the popes out of hand. I find that disturbing.

It is not, of course, that Eagleton is against authority as such, for he is quick to cite his own authorities in support of his case. What I do find peculiar is the spectacle of a Catholic Christian presuming to discuss the relationship of Christianity to society on the basis of what appears as an almost total rejection of what the highest authority in Christendom has to say with regard to it. I find this attitude not merely unfilial, but unscientific. Surely, in any serious discussion that concerns Christianity, it is essential to take into account representative and authoritative Christian opinion. In the case under consideration, this

means the popes from Leo XIII to Paul VI. However illuminating the opinions of Fathers Herbert McCabe and Laurence Bright, they are not representative in the sense understood here. They may, indeed, be worth consulting, but not in preference to the modern popes. Mr. Eagleton is a distinguished young English scholar. I am sure he would be contemptuous of the value of any kind of literary criticism undertaken without due consideration of the viewpoint of representative authority on the subject under discussion. He would no doubt rap any student in his care who indulged in this practice.

I do not wish to be mistaken here. I am not saying that only specialists should write or be consulted on their own subjects. I think it true that, though only specialists can write authoritatively on their own subjects, amateurs may have much to contribute. What you cannot do, however, is consign discussion of a subject to amateurs and expect it to be classified as anything, but amateurish. Yet, this, as I see it, is what Eagleton has done in his *New Left Church* and what you have done, in association with him, in the *Slant Manifesto*. You have discussed Christianity and society without taking into account Christian and sociological opinion on this matter that is both authoritative and representative in the best sense of that word. I am forced, therefore, at the very outset of this letter to classify Eagleton's thesis as unscientific because unrepresentative and unauthoritative in the sense just described; the essay of a Catholic, certainly, but neither a Catholic nor a scientific essay.

Maybe this is what Eagleton intended when he sat down to do his writing. In the second paragraph of his Foreword he writes that "the relation between imaginative creation and political radicalism is a traditional one in Britain". There is an indication here that he considers his own writing in the same tradition, with the underlying thought, perhaps, that, just because this is so, it ought to be taken with more than usual seriousness. I would have considered myself that the reverse was the case. Let me explain why.

Imaginative Creation and Radical Reform

We are given the thought that Eagleton's book is the

work of one whose business is imaginative creation. The implication would appear to be that this gives it a special value, presumably on the assumption that, when artists and literary men propose remedies for social disorder, they bring to this task the same power of imaginative creation that they exert with such benefit to us all in the world of letters, literature and the arts. Neither is it any coincidence, if I understand Eagleton aright, that their solutions should be radical. Detached by the nature of their profession from the complexities of what he describes as a "philistine capitalism", they are the first to recognise its sordid essence as fragmenting the wholeness of human nature. Their very distance from it assists their vision of its inadequacies. Hence their cry that the capitalist system should be swept away.

Now I would be the first to agree with Eagleton that there has long existed in this country a connection between intellectuals given to the arts and political radicalism. But I cannot agree that this enables us to classify the radical solutions they propose as imaginative and worthy, therefore, of close attention. After all, it needs only a brief review of the radical solutions placed before this country in the course of its history to recognise that one characteristic is common to them all, and this is their superficiality. Economics may not be an exact science, but it is certainly an exacting one. The same applies to sociology and politics. Their practical application calls for qualities very different, I would say, from those found in the poet, the artist or the man of letters. Very understandably, these are among the first to be baffled by the complexities of the economic scene. Their finely balanced, intuitive minds are not built to deal with economic and social problems whose attempted solution requires the exercise of a kind of patient application foreign to their nature. At the same time, economic and political complexities impinge roughly at times on their lives. They become baffled and irritated. Moreover, the more sordid side of industrial life offends their æsthetic sense. Again, they are more likely than others, perhaps, to be moved to compassion by the plight of the poor. What more natural,

then, than that the intellectual should rise in his wrath, castigate capitalism as offensive to God and man, and call for its removal? Imagination is certainly at work here, but not imaginative creation. It is imagination exploding in frustration, which leads the intellectual to denounce capitalism and call for its replacement with radical systems so *simpliste* as to be unworthy, really, of serious consideration.

Simple Solutions and Inhumanity

All this is understandable. Many will sympathise with the frustrated wrath of the intellectual in face of social injustice. They will be with him in his denunciation of the economic abuses that produce it. At the same time, they will notice that his power of imaginative creation usually stops short at this point. When it comes to positive proposals for the radical reconstruction of an unjust social order, the intellectual has little to contribute beyond vague exhortations in favour of a better world. The reason why has already been given: social and economic reconstruction is a complex task; its successful accomplishment requires men of a mentality rather different from those whose lives are given to letters and the arts.

The important thing, surely, is that the intellectual or imaginative creator should recognise this, seeing his relationship to the solution of social problems as largely prophetic. Let him denounce and exhort, like the prophets of old; but let him refrain from carrying his exhortations over into the open advocacy of social systems whose radical simplicity he finds appealing, but whose underlying inhumanity he either fails to observe or shuts his eyes to. Unfortunately, however, this is just what far too many intellectuals are tempted to do. They are attracted by the apparent simplicity of radical programmes and led, thereby, into unjustified tolerance in face of the cruelty thought necessary to enforce them. What catches them is the apparent simplicity of these radical solutions. Liquidation, indeed, is a messy business, but it is simpler and shorter than the complexities of gradualist reform. And, after it, there is the dawn. The

cruelties will pass; then peace will come. Meanwhile, one can go out and buy a pair of blinkers.

Intellectual Complacency and Inhuman Cruelty

You must forgive me, gentlemen, if I appear to have overstated my case. I do not think I have done so. What has shocked me in past years has been the complacency in the face of cruelty and injustice displayed by those whom Eagleton describes as engaged in the work of imaginative creation. I have been shocked particularly by the selective nature of their complacency. Rarely have their voices been raised against outrages committed in furtherance of radical revolution. Their wrath has always been reserved for those who have had the temerity to oppose the inhumanity which underlies the apparent simplicities of revolutionary radicalism. I say "apparent" because, in fact, radical revolutions hardly ever succeed in achieving their common objective. Their very nature as violent upheavals means that they take little account of the claims of principle and tend, once they are in their stride, to by-pass the most elementary claims of human dignity. They end, as a rule, by eating their own children. You would say, I imagine, that it is the bourgeoisie who snatch away the fruits of revolution. I would prefer to describe the process as one by which human nature gradually reasserts itself; but that is another story.

Neither Positive nor Concrete

Meanwhile, I am left with the thought that both Eagleton and yourselves are very much in the radical tradition. As with so many other young intellectuals I think this is the case mainly because the seeming simplicity of its solutions appeals to you. Had you remained content with a denunciation of social injustice, you would have remained true to the prophetic role which the intellectual should play in these matters; but you have passed beyond this stage and proceeded to open advocacy of a socialist solution mainly, I believe once again, because you are in love with its apparent simplicity. It is your way of getting rid of that stockbroker

whom Eagleton dislikes so much. The details of his removal you appear to be content to leave to the system. As I see it, your advocacy of Socialism is as a simple "remedy" for the inadequacies and injustices of our present social system. Beyond this I cannot discover that you have any concrete proposals of your own to offer. However, we will come to that later. All I am content to point out at this stage is that, in your uncritical advocacy of Socialism as a remedy for existing evils, you are true to that tradition which associates the imaginatively creative mind of the intellectual with a simplistic radicalism in the field of social reform. What, after all, could be more simple than cutting off a tyrant's head? The problem is what comes afterwards. So far, revolutionary radicalism has done little more than clear the way uncomprehendingly for another tyrant to come and take his place.

The Need for Patronage

There is a further reason, gentlemen, why, in these latter days, the radical reformism advocated by so many intellectuals should take a distinctly socialist turn. I am not attributing it to yourselves, merely noting it here as worth consideration.

My point is a simple one. It is that imaginative creators — intellectuals associated with letters and the arts — are very often in need of a patron. In many cases, the nature of their work is such as to leave them without hope of, even, the minimum income necessary to support their creative efforts. Some, of course, achieve fame and, with it, deserved material success. Most do not, yet remain dedicated to their work. Nearly all in their formative years have to endure hardship to achieve even the first beginnings of a promise of success. They have to suffer much to persist in the beginnings of the vocation to which they feel they are called. In an earlier age, poor writers and artists often found patrons amongst the rich. In eighteenth-century England, for example, rich landowners and merchants, members of the nobility and others extended assistance to poor scholars, writers and artists, taking them

into their households as private tutors to their children, fitting them into secretarial posts and such in order that they might be given opportunity to get on with their work of imaginative creation.

Please do not misunderstand me at this point. I am not defending material inequality on the ground that, in days gone by, rich patrons furthered the work of artists and men of letters. I am merely pointing out that this used to be the case and that, now that this is no longer so, it is the most natural thing in the world that poor intellectuals and others should turn elsewhere for patronage. In practice, this means the State. Having levelled down the rich in the interests of what is considered as social justice, government finds itself inevitably at the receiving end of appeals from those who once sought for patrons from amongst the rich whom it has now disinherited. Responsibility for the arts nowadays has become more and more the task of government. Miss Jennie Lee, the Minister of Culture, and her colleagues are doing what they can on the budget allowed them. Inevitably, however, many intellectuals are still dissatisfied, either because they are still outside the net of government patronage or feel that they should still receive more of it. At the same time, they note the somewhat lavish patronage extended by Soviet Communism, for example, to ballerinas, artists, writers and such; all those Cossacks thumping about from time to time in the Albert Hall. They associate this munificence not merely with government concern for culture, but with the coming to power of a *socialist* State. What more natural, then, than that they should hope for the coming to this country of a similar set-up that would accord them the same advantages?

Equalitarianism and Privilege

It is for this reason that so many intellectuals are levellers, equalitarians; not because they believe in equalitarianism for all, but because they hope that, in an equalitarian State, they will enjoy the privilege of being more equal than others. It is, when you come to think of it, a

paradoxical state of mind, but it is very pronounced. The unease its proponents may feel from time to time is covered over by their conviction that the work they do is done for the benefit of the people. Consequently, the people ought to support it. Artists, they believe, have a right to the support of "the masses", even if it has to be dragged out of them. The implication reveals the arrogance that goes to the making of their case: it is that artists and other intellectuals know better than the people themselves what is good for the people. It is this element in the thinking used to support the intellectual's advocacy of full state Socialism that I find particularly detestable, not only for its arrogance, but for its unthinkable hypocrisy.

Capitalism and Poor Intellectuals

There is a final point in this analysis that should now be made. It is that the material success of capitalism—its unrivalled power to produce wealth—has turned it into its own worst enemy. Whatever one thinks of the social effects of this system—what it does to people—it has proved itself better equipped, I would say, than any other system to create the wealth men want in the shortest possible time. This may be insufficient ground for praise, gentlemen, in your eyes or mine. We will discuss this point another time. In this context, I would merely ask you to note the fact. Capitalism has brought many from rags to riches in double-quick-time. Under the circumstances, it is almost inevitable that those still in rags or, at least, not yet in riches, should feel the gap that separates them from the more affluent members of society; that they should curse this gap and, with it, the system that has, as they think, made them poor. This is an understandably sour way of putting things. What I would like to emphasise here, however, is not its sourness, but its inaccuracy. The trouble with capitalism is not that it has created poverty; it is, rather, that it has failed to remove it at sufficient speed. It has left too many people poor. Under the circumstances, it is almost inevitable that the more vocal amongst the poverty-stricken, confronted with the contrast between the wealth of the relatively few

and the poverty they share with many others, should curse the capitalist system, however illogically, for *making them poor*. In fact, the real fault of capitalism in this respect, is that it has not made people rich fast enough. It is, under the circumstances, not merely illogical, but self-defeating to call for its destruction at the hands of the socialist State. Nevertheless, this, very often, is what down-at-heel intellectuals do, not, at base, because they are equalitarians, but because they see in Socialism the opportunity of wealth and privileged position, which a capitalist world has hitherto denied them. It is not malice that has been at work here, simply the fact that raising living standards takes a great deal of time.

Capitalist Wealth and Social Reform

It would be wrong to interpret the above as a defence of the prevailing capitalist order. Those who indicate its good points are not, thereby, denying its bad ones: little good is done when hatred of what is bad in a system leads us to irrational denial of that which is good. Contemporary capitalism has attendant injustices which no student of social reform should ever neglect. It is not in excuse of these that I have emphasised its capacity to produce wealth. Moreover, the wealth capitalism does produce is often badly distributed. One trouble with Socialism, however, is that, in its anxiety to set right distributive injustice, it lays itself open to the danger of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The execution may cause temporary satisfaction to some. In the end, we are all run into the ground. Have-nots who destroy to spite those who have, end up by depriving themselves of the means of life. Poverty is not cured by depriving a nation of its means of wealth: all that happens under such circumstances is that all are made poor. There is little satisfaction in that. On balance, reforms in the interests of an egalitarian society probably bring more suffering than those experienced under capitalist unequalitarianism. They certainly promote more bitterness. And, at the end of it all, one is left with the supreme irony that egalitarianism, after all the cruelty that has gone to

enforcement, produces a social situation more inegalitarian, if anything, than that which went before. All that has happened, in fact, is that power has passed, beneath the veneer of social reform, from one group to another; and, in most cases, the last group is far worse than the first. The state capitalism of Socialism is merely its private counterpart with knobs on.

It may be, of course, that we cannot be just without being poor; that the business of wealth-getting is beyond our moral powers; that salvation must be sought in self-subsistence. I am not of this opinion myself. Those who damn capitalism as intrinsically evil, whilst turning a blind eye to socialist contradiction, appear to me to approach it very closely indeed.

I have done no more in this first letter than comment on a couple of phrases which caught my fancy on the first page of Eagleton's Foreword to *The New Left Church*. Were I to proceed at this length with the whole of your writing, my work would never end. Next time, if I can manage a next, I will try to cover a great deal more ground. Meanwhile, I hope you will find something of interest in these my first thoughts on your approach to social reform.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Crane, S.J.

Intellectual and Tyrant

The love of the intellectual for order has often led to a hatred of the disorder implicit in common human existence. Hence in the Utopias all trace of recognisable human life is removed. Property and wives are held in common, people sleep in dormitories, with their names above the bed (Campanella), foreign travel is forbidden (Plato), dress is turned into a uniform, and meals are eaten in communal halls. Intellectuals have often supported tyrants: Voltaire and Diderot supported Catherine the Great, Comte the Czar Nicholas, and Shaw and the Webbs the infamous Stalin. For further details see Bertrand De Jouvenel's book *Power*.

With the best will in the world many of us tend to live in watertight compartments. Professionally and socially our circle of acquaintances is narrow. We really have no conception how the other half lives.

The Two Worlds

E. L. WAY

IN his novel *Sybil*, published in 1845, Disraeli gives a graphic description of the rural town of Marney. It was in a spreading valley, close to a clear and lively stream, and backed by lofty hills. But behind that laughing landscape, disease and poverty fed upon the guts of a miserable population. The cottages built of rubble let in the wind and the rain, water streamed down the walls, and the family lived in the only two rooms the tenements possessed. These hovels had no lavatories, and near every door there was a dungheap on which all kinds of filth was flung. With miserable wages the peasant returned to his 'home' "to encounter the worst of diseases, with a frame the least qualified to oppose them; a frame that subdued by toil, was never sustained by animal food; drenched by the tempest, could not change its dripping rags; and was indebted for its scanty fuel to the windfalls of the woods".

And Holy Church at Marney had forgotten her mission. The vicar considered he had done his duty if he preached two sermons a week. He usually "enforced humility on his congregation, and gratitude for the blessings of this life". But he suffered too. "Married, and a father, he received for his labours the small tithes of the parish, which secured to him an income by no means equal to that of a superior banker's clerk, or the cook of a great loanmonger. The great tithes of Marney, which might be counted by thousands, swelled the vast rental which was drawn from this district by the fortunate earls that bore its name." Of course, someone set alight to the ricks at the Abbey farm, and the

villagers stood looking at the blaze and would not lend a hand to put it out.

"And what do you think of this fire?" said Egremont to the labourer, who answered: "I think 'tis hard times for the poor, sir." "But rick-burning will not make the times easier, my good man." The good man made no reply.

England Now

The myth of an affluent society, which is supposed to have come into existence at some unspecified date after 1945, has taken such a hold on some of us that a reader may well ask what relevance Disraeli's description of his England has for us today. The answer is really quite simple. We have only to study the papers, with pen and scissors ready, to discover that 18 per cent of households are living below subsistence level, that this involves 2½ million of our children, and that if we have a severe winter a few thousand of our babies, and as many old people will not be alive in March. In the same newspapers we read of a redundant car worker who lay down with his face to the exhaust pipe of his vehicle and was found dead in his garage. The coroner said at the inquest that the man was "undoubtedly worried about redundancy". It has not yet penetrated our skulls that to sack a man can be the equivalent of a death sentence. If he is in his fifties, and is a "shake-out", and can't get another job, his plight is desperate. What is he to do? Get a job in a bakery from 3.30 a.m. until 6 p.m., six days a week with two half-days, for £11 a week?

Cathy Can't Come Home

How many saw the BBC-1 television play on November 16th last year? It was called *Cathy Come Home*, was written by Jeremy Sandford, and was seen by 12 million viewers. Put briefly, for those who didn't see it, the story is of two young people very much in love who want a family. They have three children. The father, a lorry driver, has an accident and loses his job, and the brief happiness of this couple is destroyed. They descend into the hell of the

homeless, a Rachman world, sink through that into the slums, and then flee to a caravan site from which they are eventually chased, and finally end up in an appalling hostel for the homeless. The father is banished from his wife and young family, and their married life is broken up. The state's officials declare that the children are not properly looked after and must be taken into care. The wife angrily says "give me a place to live in with them and their father and they need no other care". A shattering scene on a railway station in which the crying children are literally torn from the hysterical mother ends the play.

Other Witnesses

In *Late Night Line-Up* the same evening, two men whose families were living in hostels were interviewed on the subject of the play. The child of one of them was suffocated in a caravan, and both men said that the play was factual and accurate. Living in some of these hostels is like living in a railway station with open-ended cubicles containing beds, and disease is thrown in free of charge. But if you don't care for newspapers or television plays, the Stationery Office publishes a survey, *Homeless Single Persons*, which might be of interest. On the night of December 6-7, 1965, there were 965 people found sleeping rough; 1,956 in reception centres, another 9,000 in lodging houses or hostels, and 1,350 without accommodation. In addition the Report says that there were 34,500 solidly established in hostels and lodging houses. Of some of these hostels it has been said that "they are reminiscent of the workhouse and the poor law. We feel such attitudes belong to 1866, not 1966". And in them is to be found less privacy than can be found in prison. The washing facilities are communal and deplorable. Ten mothers and 39 children "share two baths and two functioning lavatories. The stone floors are bare and the washroom floor is often flooded. The one copper boiler leaks and spits boiling water, the rusty stoves spread coke fumes in windy weather". A recent survey carried out by the L.C.C. showed that 90 per cent of homeless people had jobs, but at wages below average. It was "impossible to

"Doubt that the homeless had made sincere efforts" to find homes, but they had been demoralised when landlords refused children.

Census Findings Inaccurate

Mr. L. Tuft, social services consultant to Christian Action, declared that the figure of 965 sleeping rough for the whole country was inaccurate. The national figure was around the 3,000 mark. Apparently the word got around that the officials were out counting heads and, Mr. Tuft said, "Rather than become involved in any official activities some of them kept walking throughout the night. I have met 50 to 60 men myself who said they had avoided the census". Mr. Ian Henderson, of Christian Action, said that the figure for the end of 1966 would be considerably higher as large numbers of casual workers became unemployed and were forced into the army of the homeless. This is what "shake-out" can mean: sleeping "in caves and cattle yards, brick kilns, bridge arches, huts and hedges, cellars and crypts, bandstands, and barns, sheds, and seafront shelters". We can increase the gross national product by swelling the numbers to be found sleeping at Waterloo, Euston, Victoria, and Paddington railway stations, not to mention the additional competition for such favoured sites as public lavatories and derelict houses. (It should not have to be mentioned that families can become homeless through no fault of their own but chiefly because they were evicted by the landlord who pleaded his own need for the premises. Many living in temporary and emergency accommodation are decent and respectable people.)

Family Allowances

The answer to some of these problems may lie in the system of family allowances. Eight shillings a week for the second child, and ten for the third, may have been inadequate in Beveridge's day. Now it's absurd. It's equivalent today would be 30/- per week per child. At the present moment £500 million a year is 'lost' to the Treasury because of income-tax allowances for children. A wealthy man not only receives family allowances but, with

two children, his tax can be reduced by £250 a year. The poor man with two children only receives 8/- per week. Is it reasonable to give the wealthy man both a family allowance and an income-tax allowance? If the cost of family allowances, about a £150 million a year, were added to the £500 million, gained by the abolition of income-tax-allowance for children, surely with the resulting £650 million a year some new plan of endowment for the family could be devised?

Other Forms of Help

It might be argued by those unfamiliar with the facts that the poorest are helped sufficiently as it is. They have rent rebates, free meals at school, school uniform and maintenance grants, free welfare foods and so on. But many of these benefits are not claimed either through fear of discrimination or through ignorance. For example, only one third of those entitled to free meals get them. And thirteen families out of sixteen are not receiving the free welfare foods they are entitled to.

Whatever the solutions, the facts must be faced, and they are extremely uncomfortable. We don't have an affluent society, instead we have two million people receiving assistance from what used to be called the National Assistance Board. There are another 750,000 old people who are living in grinding poverty because through ignorance or pride they don't ask for national assistance. "The gap between the standard of living of the sick and unemployed and the average wage earner in Britain today is even greater than it was in the 1930s," wrote Clancy Sigal in the *Weekend Telegraph* for Nov. 25th, 1966. In this England now we have young schoolmasters who have to supplement their miserable earnings by digging trenches during their holidays, and Civil Servants who become belly dancers, or part-time workers, in order to live. We ought to read Pius XII on the *just wage* more often.

In this second article the distinguished Australian, B. A. Santamaria, outlines the alternatives which face his countrymen: they will either opt to come under the sphere of Chinese influence, or they will determine to remain within the framework of western civilisation. The latter course will require a military policy, tactical nuclear weapons, a new type of soldier, an amendment to the Defence Act which will strengthen internal security, and the expenditure of 10 per cent of the G.N.P. on defence.

Australian Outlook: 2

The Alternatives

B. A. SANTAMARIA

AT this point we face a choice between two alternatives which of its very nature—because of its military, political, economic and cultural implications—is fundamental. One alternative can be simply described. We can very easily opt for an Australia which is part of the Chinese sphere of influence, Professor Fitzgerald's "natural distribution of power". That choice promises ease and comfort today, whatever it may promise tomorrow. No increased defence vote; no higher taxation; no painful entanglements like Vietnam and Malaysia; no danger of appearing to be a 'warmonger' rather than a 'peace-lover'. All that we have to do is gradually to disengage from the American embrace. Even this can be done without the unpopularity of appearing anti-American. It can be done while we protest that we are not against the American alliance, but merely against "unqualified acceptance of American policy". It can be done while we urge that we do not propose immediate

American disengagement in South Vietnam, but merely that the Americans should negotiate with the National Liberation Front, which is after all only the front window of the Viet Cong. This choice has all the attractions which ease and comfort always offer.

Survival within Western Framework

The second alternative is far more difficult to achieve. Nevertheless it can be clearly stated. It is simply to form the determination to survive as a nation within the framework of Western civilisation, and to take the necessary steps to achieve this end, whether the Americans assist us or not. This alternative is not merely difficult to achieve. It is highly uncertain whether, even if we pursue it with single-minded intensity, we can achieve it at all. Nevertheless it is one choice which Australians can make and, with effort, hope to realise. For an Australian who does not wish his country to become the physical pawn of Communist China—or a non-Communist China, or a militarist Japan or a post-Soekarno Indonesia for that matter—the basic objective of national policy can only be twofold: (a) So to conduct ourselves in the sphere of our own military, economic, development, migration and other internal policies that we give the strongest inducement to the United States to regard this country as a strongpoint on which it can base its physical presence in South East Asia. (b) Alternatively, so to conduct ourselves in the same sphere of internal policy that even if the United States does not maintain its presence in South East Asia, we develop the same power to deter attack which Israel possesses vis-à-vis the Arab States, or Sweden vis-à-vis the Soviet Union.

Fortunately, the same set of internal policies—which will be described—are calculated to lead to both objectives at one and the same time. The choice between these two alternatives is based on one's values, and is probably not fundamentally arguable one way or another. If we belong to the second school, what is important is that the nature of the two alternatives and the need for making a choice should be driven home into the Australian consciousness

as soon as possible. For every day which is wasted from the work of preparation to face the issues is a day which favours the school for "accommodation with China". Simply to do nothing is in fact to do something. I do not underestimate the difficulties facing those who make my choice. We are in exactly the same position, without the same prestige or power as men like Churchill and Vansittart between the wars. They were right about the Nazis. But they were simply disbelieved. The result of disbelief was terrible and terrifying.

Pro-Communist Left

At this point we come up against the attitudes and values of different sections of that small segment of the Australian community which is conscious of the problem we face. As I see it there are four relevant attitudes: (a) The first is that of what I can only define as the pro-Communist Left. This force is a real force. It embraces the Communist Party (Peking model) which openly supports the predominance of Communist China not only in this region but throughout the world Communist movement. It does in fact include the Communist Party (Moscow model). If the Chinese win in this area and the Soviet is unable to assert itself, that party would come to terms with its Chinese counterparts. This force includes one-third of the Australian trade union movement, including unions like the Waterside Workers' Federation, the Seamen's Union, the ARU, the AEU, which are so vital in the field of war production and the transport of war materials. Clancy's report on the Communist position within the Australian trade unions to the last Congress of the Communist Party—which makes this claim—is correct and is borne out by the voting figures at every A.C.T.U. Congress since the Labour 'split'. This force includes the group at present dominant on the Federal Conference and the Federal Executive of the A.L.P. This group has been able to define every essential foreign policy position of the A.L.P., and every essential position in the internal struggle for the control of the Labour Movement, along lines satisfactory to the present, if not the ultimate, demands of the Communist Party.

This situation within the Labour Movement has the most immediate practical consequences. Labour, under this control, is still the alternative government. It remains to be seen whether the predictions of those who say that it has no chance of being elected will be borne out after the retirement of Sir Robert Menzies. Around this central nucleus, there is the considerable power of the "fellow-travellers" who are important in the fields in which public opinion is created. The worst mistake which any observer of the Australian scene can make is to equate the power of the pro-Communist Left in Australia with its relative impotence within the British Labour Movement. The very different policies of the British Labour Government and the Australian Labour Opposition on the question of the American involvement in South Vietnam are the reflection of the underlying realities.

Hypothetical Dangers and Profits

(b) Whereas the first attitude reflects the existence of a strong political interest group, the second may at this stage merely reflect a mood. From a relatively small experience I believe that the second attitude exists and that it has grown in recent years. It is a mood which simply says that there is nothing which can be done about the ultimate predominance of Communist China in this area, and that our children will simply have to "lump" it. I have never heard this stated by people who are working class or lower middle class in social background—although the viewpoint may well exist among them. I have often heard it expressed by people who are wealthy and well-educated. I have heard it expressed by professional men; and by country interests closely wedded to the policy of expanding commercial relationships, particularly in primary products, with Communist China. How far it goes I do not know. It is not too much to say that it could be buttressed by the powerful interest groups which today control the Wheat Board and the Wool Board—the plain, fluff, no-nonsense businessmen who believe that hypothetical political dangers ought never to be allowed to interfere with present financial profits. Under some circumstances the Country Party could

ultimately become the political expression of this viewpoint, unless its more reliable elements take special precautions to prevent this development taking place.

(c) The third attitude is that of the politically amorphous mass in the centre. To a considerable—perhaps predominant — extent, it is unaware of the situation and the issues. Events are gradually making it aware of both. It is basically pro-American, as far as Australia's attachments are concerned. It is there to be won by those who believe that something can be done and ought to be done. It can be lost if it is mesmerised into losing sight of the wood for the trees. It can be lost in the maze of argument about the exact nature of the problem in Vietnam and Malaysia today, Thailand, the Philippines and Indonesia tomorrow. It can only be held if those who are determined to resist the gradual absorption of Australia into the Chinese sphere can keep the main issue clear and steady before its vision. This is far from impossible. Yet it is made extremely difficult by the existence of the fundamental materialist psychological attitudes which are so much part of the Australian way of life.

Those determined to Survive

(d) The final group is composed of those whom I quite briefly describe as "The Resistance". This force is made up of those who basically say: "We are determined to survive, whatever the cost: with the Americans if they are with us, without them if they are not". This group wants the continuation of Australia as a nation of European background, whose racial and cultural composition will no doubt be modified by the absorption of a certain proportion of Asians, but in which we ourselves will always be in command of this operation. It includes those who believe that every aspect of national policy must be subordinated to keeping the Americans in South East Asia—if we can—and to convincing them that Australians are too valuable as allies to be abandoned. It rejects with contempt, as a dishonest stupidity, the proposition that Australia can hope to attract American aid by playing the hard-to-get neutralist game, as if the Americans would be likely to react in this way to

such politics when pursued by a European nation of less than 12 million people. At the same time, the "Resistance" is quite clear-eyed and unconfused about the fact that American military assistance may not be forthcoming in every contingency and that therefore it is necessary to create such a military, economic and political structure in Australia as will guarantee the future of this country by deterring aggression until the day—if it ever comes—when the Asian situation changes.

The remainder of this paper is addressed to those who may belong to the third and fourth groups, particularly the fourth. There is no particular point in addressing it to those who belong to the first and second. It is already pretty late in the day. Those who belong to the first two groups belong to a different team. They are on a different tram going in the opposite direction. It is more important to devote time and effort to working out, with those who are on the same tram, exactly what needs to be done if the vehicle is to get to its destination, than to persuading intelligent men, who presumably have had strong reasons for making their choice, that they ought to change vehicles and go in a diametrically opposite direction to that in which they have been going for many years. Nor is it necessary that one should believe that those who have chosen a different road are necessarily malicious. De Gaulle described an almost identical situation quite dispassionately when he wrote of the difference between himself and the men of Vichy: "During the fearful cataclysm through which France was staggering, men divided into two camps had claimed to lead the nation and the state toward different goals, by contradictory paths. From that moment, the responsibility of both groups was measured on earth not by their intentions but by their acts, for the country's salvation was directly at stake. Whatever they might have thought, whatever they might have wished, judgment on all of them could only be pronounced according to their works. Afterwards let God judge their souls; France would bury their bodies!"⁽¹¹⁾

⁽¹¹⁾General de Gaulle, *War Memoirs* "Unity 1942-1944" (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1959), pp.183-4.

I address myself, therefore, particularly to the fourth group, the "resistance," and more generally to the third, the well-meaning but amorphous mass in the centre. The single issue is—what is to be done? I make no pretence to having all, or even many of the answers — and this for several reasons. I have none of the facilities which the government enjoys—none of its intelligence reports, none of its numerous, specialised and highly qualified staff. Nor have I any of the research facilities which the pro-Communist Left enjoys through its close association with many competent academics. What I can propose therefore is simply a set of indicators rather than fully formulated plans. May I list these indicators as briefly as I can.

Military Policy

(1) I accept as a definition of the kind of conflict in which we will become increasingly engaged, that which was given by Mao when he spoke of "the protracted war". He said in 1961: "If we are not wanted here or there, we can wait ten years, thirty years, one hundred years . . . Time is our good ally." The sort of problem Australia faces has to be viewed in those timeless terms. Time, unfortunately, is not necessarily our good ally. We have to make it so, by using it. I believe with Giap that the political objective—in our case, survival—dictates the nature, extent and expense of our military commitment, and the outlines of our economic policy: military, political and economic policies which are not adequate to the overriding concept of survival are themselves irrelevant. (2) The existence of adequate military power to meet the continuing demands of protracted war is, of course, not the same thing as having a correct policy. But it is the only foundation on which any real policy can be erected. Otherwise policy is simply a series of debating points. It is not for me, as a layman in military affairs, to spell out, in military terms, what this means in the size of ground, sea and air forces or in the money which is to be spent on them. Yet, I do not think that the practical formulation of proposals ought to be left either to the generals or the politicians. There is a field of discussion

and research for many of us in an area which has been pioneered in recent years by academics like Professor Titterton and Dr. T. B. Millar. However, in the field of military policy, I would propose the following guide-lines: (a) There is no economic justification for the viewpoint that Australia has not the resources for a military policy designed to preserve independence by deterring attack. Australia's gross national product in 1965-6 will be approximately £10,000 million. It should not be considered extraordinary to spend 10 per cent of that product on defence. This would be £1,000 million. We have only to compare this with what we actually propose to spend to see that we can therefore afford much larger resources than we are proposing to spare at the present moment. (b) To clarify the issues for the voters and to force all political parties to stand up and be counted on the defence issue, it would be useful technique to establish a separate defence budget, financed by a special category of taxes. The people could then vote clear-mindedly on what they wish to spend on defence. Parties would have fewer opportunities of confusing defence expenditure with total expenditure. Management, primary producers and the unions would have a useful measuring rod to determine whether the sacrifices demanded in the name of defence are in fact equal.

Nuclear Power

(c) Since China will develop rapidly as a nuclear power, and until there is effective nuclear disarmament, Australia ought to develop its own supply of tactical nuclear weapons. We can quite conceivably face a situation of Chinese—perhaps even Indonesian—nuclear blackmail, and the reluctance of the United States to risk its cities in preventing a military attack on Australia. Dr. Millar put this problem baldly on page 59 of "Australia's Defence". It has been estimated by competent authorities that this nuclear power would require about 1,000 scientists, that it would involve an initial investment of £400 million and an annual expenditure well within our compass. (d) The immediate problem is not the physical defence of Australian soil. No Chinese attack on

Australian territory is possible today. Indeed this may never be the way in which Australia falls within the area of China's predominance. The road from neutral to satellite state can be traversed by strictly political means. The immediate problem is to help whatever forces in South East Asia may wish to keep their countries outside the area of Chinese predominance. The problems arise from what Dr. Millar calls (pp. 58-9) the "coldly practical terms" which make it necessary for Australia to assist any effort calculated to deny South East Asian countries to China: (1) the need of our own industries for raw materials like rubber and oil—many of which come from South East Asian countries—which could be used to blackmail us if those countries fell under enemy control; (2) the fact that "75 per cent of our exports and 70 per cent of our imports followed trade routes vulnerable to a hostile maritime power in South East Asia"; (3) "the danger that a hostile maritime power in South East Asia, operating submarines near our ports, would constitute against the 99 per cent of our imports and exports which go by ship, and against our considerable coastal trade."⁽¹²⁾ There are in fact forces in South East Asia which wish to keep their countries out of the Red Chinese sphere of influence—in South Vietnam, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, in Indonesia. It must be accepted that if there are governments in South East Asia which do not wish to become subordinated to the Chinese Communists—like those mentioned—they are likely to be confronted with classic patterns of guerilla warfare. This is the significance of Professor Fitzgerald's statement that Communist China will use "*any* means short of war" to overthrow governments in South East Asia linked with the United States. Whatever may be the demands of air and naval power on our resources, it is obvious that we will need large numbers of ground troops to assist in these operations—but ground troops of a particular type. As Tanham pointed out in his work "Communist Revolutionary Warfare", the Communists have trained their troops specifically for this type of operation: "One of the lessons of the war in Indo-China is that,

(¹²) *Australia's Defence*, pp. 58-9

in training troops that may have to face guerilla type warfare, the West would do well to broaden its own concept of military duty to include a large variety of ways in which each soldier must be prepared to serve."⁽¹³⁾

New type of Soldier

He had already said of the Communist guerilla: "Each soldier had to be not only a fighter, but a propagandist, a political agent and even a labourer as the situation required."⁽¹⁴⁾ It would be looking somewhat ahead of practical probabilities to believe that Australian troops could be trained to fulfil all of these functions. Nonetheless a recent article in the "Canberra Times" (27 May, 1965) on the war in Borneo headed "THE CRUCIAL BATTLE IS BEHIND THE LINES" indicates that Western troops are already engaged in part in operations of this kind: "If soldiers are directed to win over the local people, with their great ingenuity and resources they soon become indispensable. So it is in Borneo, in every sphere of activity their advice is being sought, their help granted — in road and bridge building; in water purification and supply schemes; haulage; ferry services and medical evacuation by helicopter and light aircraft; in the daily surgeries attended by the scores of tribespeople wherever there is a medical orderly . . ." It is large numbers of that type of soldier which our military establishment will be called upon to produce. It is precisely the type of operation in which the Australian can be expected to excel. This demand will call upon special skills of the educated sections of the Australian community even more than upon the unskilled group which some may regard as the most obviously eligible for military service. This pattern of military power, which is within Australia's compass can provide a reasonable base for the achievement of the two foreign policy objectives which, as I have stated elsewhere, ought to be the major aims of Australian policy: (i) the retention of an active American military presence in South East Asia; or alternatively the acquisition of deterrent power of our

(¹³) George K. Tanham, *Communist Revolutionary Warfare—The Vietminh in Indo-China* (Methuen, London, 1962), p. 141.

(¹⁴) *Ibid.*, p. 140.

own; (ii) the initiation of closer forms of military, political and economic association between India, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand and perhaps—with a very big question mark—a post-Soekarno Indonesia. In other words, we merely have to do the same thing to give ourselves a series of alternatives.

Internal Security

This pattern of foreign and military policy is incompatible with an internal policy which acts on the assumption that we are in a situation of peace and normalcy. We are in fact at this moment engaged in a struggle whose end can be our own destruction. Under these circumstances: *salus populi suprema lex*. The freedom of legitimate voluntary groups within our society should not be limited: but the operations of bodies associated with the enemy should. What is involved in this proposition? I have already stated that from the viewpoint of the strategic danger to Australia, the fact that China is Communist is not necessarily of the essence of the problem. Japan in 1941 was far from Communist. But, being Communist, China has the enormous advantage of a ready-made fifth column in this country. If we are to prepare for a protracted struggle, the fifth column must be recognised and treated as such. The most up-to-date statement of the reciprocal obligations which exist between the Communist Party of China and official Communist organisation in other countries — Australia not excluded — were stated by the Chinese Minister for Defence in the article published in *Red Flag* to which I have already referred. It is stated quite clearly that a country in which the Communists have won has the duty to use its armed forces to help in the triumph of revolution in a country in which the Communists have yet to win. In an obvious criticism of Soviet 'revisionism' Le Jui-ching wrote: "Whether or not a country which has won victory dares to serve as a base area for the world revolution and to support and aid the people's revolution in other countries is the touchstone of whether or not it is really for revolution and whether or not it really opposes imperialism."⁽¹⁸⁾ But the

⁽¹⁸⁾*Peking Review*, 14 May, 1965.

duties are reciprocal. The duty of local Communists to tie down "enemy forces"—that is, their own national army in their own country—is also re-stated. This can be done most easily when Communists control strategically important sections of the trade union movement, as they do in Australia. The pattern of stoppages in Australian defence establishments and elsewhere in 1964-5 has shown that the local Communists regard themselves as bearing special responsibilities in the fields of inland and maritime transport, in the power, metal and engineering industries. Together these are essential to war production and to the transport of troops and material. These are areas of the Australian economy in which it would be illogical to permit local Communists to operate in a period in which Australian troops are to be sent overseas to fight Communist troops abroad. It would be by far the best course if Australian trade unionists dealt with this problem in their own way. However, so long as the anti-Communist resistance in the Australian union movement is isolated on sectarian grounds, and so long as the A.L.P. obliges the Communist Party by 'prohibiting' the NCC while its own members — with certain noticeable exceptions — either unite with the Communists or do nothing, it is uncertain that a sufficient result can be achieved in time.

Defence Act Should be Amended

In the regrettable circumstances which prevail, the following steps seem necessary: (a) The Defence Act ought to be amended to make it an offence to give 'aid and comfort' to an enemy against whom Australian troops are in operation even if, for political reasons, there is no formal declaration of war. In other words, the acts which would be punishable if there were a formal declaration of war ought to be punishable in a situation in which Australian troops are engaged in de facto military operations. It is ludicrous that Australian citizens ought to go unpunished when, for instance, they attend conferences summoned in Hanoi specifically for the support of the Viet Cong, who have already killed one Australian soldier and many of our American allies. (b) No

Communist Party member should be eligible for employment in any industry engaged in war production of any kind, or with the transport of war materials. (c) No union with Communist officials should be permitted to represent workers engaged in war production or the transport of materials for war either in negotiations with employers or in appearance before arbitration tribunals. (d) Union leaders who drag members into political stoppages aimed against the defence policy defined by the Australian Government ought to be dealt with by the type of special legislation introduced belatedly by the Chifley Labour Government during the 1949 Coal Strike.

It will be noted that these suggestions do not interfere with the legal existence of either of the Communist parties, with the right of Australian citizens to join them, or with the right of trade unions generally to elect Communist officials. The propositions merely accept the fact that Communists, in the existing situation, should be treated individually as enemy aliens. They merely preclude those who avail themselves of this freedom from occupying positions from which they can disrupt industries connected with the defence programme and military operations. I do not believe that any political party—Communist, Fascist or Nazi—whose *raison d'être* involves the destruction of democratic liberties has any right to claim democratic liberties for itself at any time. As a matter of technique, however, the process of restriction ought to be measured by the degree of national emergency which exists from time to time. At this moment, the measures suggested should be sufficient to preclude damage to the defence effort.

Economic Policy

The final consideration which needs to be discussed is that of economic policy. The essence of the economic policy problem is the proper allocation of manpower and resources to the sectors of defence, development and basic industry in a situation in which the weapons of manpower direction, raw material allocation and price control which operated *after* the Japanese attack in the Second World War are not avail-

able. I am not an economist, so can only proffer what I feel to be a few useful observations. (1) Australia's Gross National Product in 1965-6 is likely to be near £10,000 million. It is growing at the rate of at least 8 per cent per annum. If we spend ultimately even 10 per cent of our G.N.P. on defence it would be £1,000 million, which illustrates how little we are doing at the present moment. We could invest up to 30 per cent of our Gross National Product on development and essential industries. We ought to be able to face cuts in British and U.S. investment with equanimity. After all, they amount at the most to only about £250 million per annum. Our difficulties are not in the accountancy procedures, but rather in ensuring that short manpower and short materials go into the more essential rather than the less essential areas of the economy. Differential taxation is an adequate weapon for this purpose at this stage. (2) Our engineering industry in its equipment and skilled manpower ought to be capable of the output of arms and equipment needed for a full-scale military effort. It is worth noting that even during the Second World War, Australia was a net contributor to the industrial aspect of the war effort in the Pacific. The automobile industry which is today making a disproportionate demand on labour and materials, and which is a source of many of the abuses inherent in hire-purchase, ought to be put to work more usefully on defence production. At the same time, as the parlous progress of the Mirage jet project indicates, the kind of industrial sabotage initiated last year by the A.E.U. over the production of the FN rifle is not the only problem which we face in war production. There is a serious problem of inefficient management in certain Government-controlled defence establishments. There is the total—and increasing—shortage of skilled labour which can now only be made up by the programmes of wartime training introduced by agreement between the Government and the unions during the Second World War. (3) One critical issue which will rapidly face Australia is that of eligibility for national service. In the *New York Times* of 13th May, 1965, James Reston pointed to inequities in the American draft, similar

in type to those which have evoked public criticism in Australia. I would like to quote Reston because I believe that what he says relates directly to our own situation: "To deal with the inequality of the present draft, some observers here would like to revive the old idea of a comprehensive form of national service in which more men could meet their obligation to the nation in the armed services or in useful civil occupations. Thus, a young man might not be able to meet the physical standards for military combat, but might meet his obligation in the job-training corps, the Peace Corps, in social work in the city or rural slums, or even as auxiliary policeman in some of the urban jungles . . . This goes against the American opposition to widespread conscription, but at least it is worth considering at a time when new military, industrial, scientific and social problems are forcing a review of the nation's manpower . . . The immediate issue is military, but the effective training and utilisation of American manpower is much wider and more important and will have to be studied not by the Pentagon alone but by the whole Government, and by thoughtful and creative minds outside the Government as well". I suggest that this principle of national service ought to be made effective in Australia in the form of a two-year national service commitment for every youth at the age of 19 or 20, to be spent in one or other of the forms of service listed by Reston. Those remaining in civilian industry should have a system of deferred pay included in their wage structure, which would ensure equality at least of financial sacrifice, which would help to remove a strong inflationary pressure, to restrict demands of less essential industries, and to provide investment resources for development programmes and basic industries.

Conclusion

I am not so foolish as to believe that all of these things will be done or that any of them will necessarily be done. It depends on the results of the central conflict in Australian political life. The correct political solution which would permit the achievement of the objective outlined would be

the rapid evolution of a bi-partisan consensus between the two major political parties along the lines of this programme. A bi-partisan consensus in the fields of foreign and defence policy has been the political cement of British and American society, and the safeguard of parliamentary institutions. Such a consensus cannot develop in Australia unless there is achieved what I have called a "principled unity" between the A.L.P. and the D.L.P. in a party which would include the non-Communist and anti-Communist Left, but exclude the pro-Communist Left.⁽¹⁶⁾

If the Communist Party (acting through the group of affiliated unions which it controls, to whose dominance in the A.L.P. Mr. C. Oliver paid tribute last year) wins its fight and perpetuates the split between the A.L.P. and D.L.P., I foresee a polarisation of Australian politics along two clearly defined lines. One will in effect be pro-Chinese in the sense of working for an accommodation between Australia and Communist China. Australia's first position will be that of a neutralist power, her last that of a satellite. The politicians who would lead this party are already clearly identified. The interest groups behind this party grouping comprise those whom I listed in the first two categories of Australian opinion. They create a powerful combination and they would be opposed to practically every step which I have outlined. The other party would be broadly defined as 'pro-American'. It would carry the great burden of putting forward onerous and unpopular policies. Yet I suspect that it is precisely this type of programme which might provide the key to the enigma of the "Younger Generation", which would evoke its capacity for enthusiasm and sacrifice.

⁽¹⁶⁾B.A. Santamaria, *The Price of Freedom* (Campion Press, 1964), p. 13.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

It is a sceptical age, but for Catholics there are clearly defined limits. The Slant group show scant respect for the great encyclicals on social teaching. And Dr. Jackson considers that the group talk fine sounding philosophical nonsense when they attempt a critique of capitalism. If they expect to be taken seriously they must get down to concrete problems, for example, how would redundancy be tackled with workers' control?

CREDO

J. M. JACKSON

A BRIEF reflection on the Creed we recite each Sunday at mass is instructive. "*Credo in unum Deum . . . et in unum Dominum Nostrum . . . et in Spiritum Sanctum . . . et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam . . .*" The International Committee on English in the Liturgy do not appear to share the belief of those responsible for the current translation in use in Britain that one *in* may have been dropped accidentally from the Latin text and needs to be re-inserted in the English. The draft texts prepared by the International Committee make it clear that we "believe one holy, catholic and apostolic church". We believe the church, the evidence in the world of the Holy Spirit. The creed is our expression of belief in the one triune God who speaks to us through his church.

A Sceptical Age

We are living in a sceptical age. Ideas and beliefs are no longer accepted merely because they are traditional. Even within the Church this is happening, and up to a point it is right that it should. There is no reason, for example, why we should not question the efficiency of our Catholic

schools, or ask whether the time has not come for a much greater say in their control and in planning the Catholic educational system to be given to parents. The case for Catholic education is argued in terms of parental rights, but how much say does the average Catholic parent have in the education of his children? Are the pastoral methods of the Church those best suited to the needs of the times? When priests are so scarce, especially in mission areas and in South America, would it not be better if much of the responsibility shouldered by the clergy in financial and social matters were given to laymen?

Even in doctrinal fields there may need to be changes. Although the fundamental teaching of the Church may be unchanging, it may still be possible to come to a deeper understanding of certain doctrines, or to see new ways of presenting them which will be more comprehensible to our contemporaries outside the Church. In matters of morals, there will certainly need to be a working out of fresh applications of old principles to new situations. We cannot expect to find in older writers ready-made answers to the problems posed by the growth of large-scale industry, nuclear weapons or modern spare-part surgery.

How far may one go in this questioning of established ideas and practices? Some years ago there were those who regarded it as near heresy to suggest that the vernacular might be used in the liturgy, yet this has now become the rule and Latin the exception. One may even argue that the Council of Trent was mistaken in condemning the use of the vernacular, though it is easy to understand why it took the view it did. Neither pope nor council is infallible in such matters of what is desirable practice or discipline. In questioning the commonly accepted *teaching* of the Church, however, there is obviously a need for much greater caution. It is not good enough to say that one is completely free to question anything which has not actually been the subject of an infallible definition.

Inadequate Official Social Teaching

Is a belief in the Holy Spirit, speaking through the Church,

as we profess regularly in the Creed, really compatible with this sceptical attitude towards the established teaching of the Church? Is it compatible with an attitude of mind that is not only prepared to ask questions but which shows the scantest respect for the most carefully considered letters of Christ's own vicar? What are we to make of a group of so-called Catholics who embark on the study of social questions not inspired by the great encyclicals of popes from Leo XIII to John XXIII but because "we believe that we have an especial need to consider ideas of this kind, in view of the often quite inadequate official social teaching of the church"?*(¹) It appears that these people want from the Church a blueprint for political action, for later there is a reference to "the institutional vagueness of Christian social thinking . . . through the anti-socialist reformism of Cardinal Manning, to the ambivalence of *Rerum Novarum*, where accommodation of socialist feeling is made within what remains a conservative framework and any number of political readings are possible".*(²)

A couple more quotations will suffice to show the *Slant* attitude to the social encyclicals. There is a reference to the "apparent (my italics) denunciation (of capitalism) in, for example, *Rerum Novarum*""*(³) whilst *Mater et Magistra* is regarded as a further watering down of the attack on the capitalist spirit: "*Mater et Magistra* does move forward from the anachronistic opposition of its predecessors, but only to give overall validation to contemporary neo-capitalism".(⁴)† Finally, there is this: "The number of phoney re-definitions here the reader can work out for himself. The move from an anachronistic organicism, through a functionalism relating to the corporate state, to the full neo-capitalism of *Mater et Magistra*, marks the final lurching collapse of catholic social thought as a criticism of capitalism.††"(⁵)

(¹)*'Slant Manifesto' *Catholics and the Left*, Sheed and Ward, London, 1966, p. 51.

(²)**Ibid.* p. 75. Lest it be thought I have obscured the meaning by partial quotation, let me add that the quotation is a complete sentence taken from the original with no modification beyond the substitution of a lower case *t* in the opening *the*.

(³)**Ibid.* p. 94

(⁴)†*Ibid.* p. 102.

(⁵)†*Ibid.* p. 104

In fact, the *Slant* team have been remiss in that they have failed to push this attack on the social teaching of the popes far enough. A little further study would have shown them that the rot set in a long time before Leo XIII. What about this appeal for patience in the face of oppression and the failure to demand a radical reform of the society that made such oppression possible? "Servants, be submissive to your masters with all respect, not only to the kind and gentle but also the overbearing. For one is approved if, mindful of God, he endures pain while suffering unjustly."*(⁶)

What did the Jews expect?

It may be objected that this is a counsel of perfection to the oppressed and that it does not relieve the more fortunate members of society of their duty to help the oppressed, preferably by altering a social system that makes oppression possible. This is true, up to a point. Nevertheless, where in the scriptures or in the Early Church do we hear the clarion call to social revolution?

The Jews looked for a Messiah who would deliver them from the tyranny of Rome, but he came to deliver them from the tyranny of sin. The *Slant Manifesto* suggests that we should transform "*this world into the Kingdom of God*". So we should, and do we not daily pray "Thy Kingdom come", but what is the Kingdom of God? Are we not told to "seek first (the heavenly father's) kingdom and his righteousness and all these things (our material needs) shall be your also".*(⁷) And again, does Our Lord himself not say to Pilate, "My kingship is not of this world".**(⁸).

The *Slant* group have their priorities wrong. In this emphasis on the social nature of Christianity and the need for social reform, they seem to be making the same mistake as the Jews who looked for the restoration of the political kingdom of Israel. "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength and with all your mind; and your neighbour as

(⁶)*First Letter of Peter, Ch. 2, vv. 18-19.

(⁷)*Mathew Ch. 6, v. 33

(⁸)**John Ch. 18, v. 36.

yourself."†⁽⁹⁾ The love of God comes first, and the love of one's neighbour follows. But in the *Slant Manifesto* we are told: "My own experience of Christ is derived from the community's experience of him; he is present to me, not because I am personally devout, but simply because I am part of his community, inserted into his body".††⁽¹⁰⁾ and again: "We love God by loving each other, in the act of loving each other; Christ is present to us in so far as we are present to each other. We are saved, not by the intensity of our private love for God, nor by devotion to the sacraments or self-denial; we are saved by the degree to which we create community in the world".*⁽¹¹⁾

No Political Programme

There can be no political programme which can command the support of all Catholics. It is the duty of each and every Catholic to take an active interest in politics, and to exert his influence for what he believes to be the right course of action, whether he thinks it appropriate to do this only through the ballot box, or through active membership of a political party, or through some other means. We can hardly expect them all to be in agreement about what is politically desirable. The church is guided by the Holy Spirit in matters of faith and morals; it is in these fields that we may, in appropriate cases, expect infallible definitions to be made by a Council or by the Vicar of Christ. If we read the *Slant Manifesto*, one cannot avoid the impression that the writers seem to think the Holy Spirit is very niggardly in His guidance, possibly confining it to those rare occasions when a solemn, infallible definition is made. Then, above all, the Church is guided, but surely it is not just this that Our Lord promised when he said the Father would send the Holy Spirit in His name, and that He Himself would be with His Church to the end of time? Yet it is suggested that many in the Church—popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, theologians—have all made errors in matters of faith and morals. That individuals at all these levels have occasionally

⁽⁹⁾†Luke, Ch. 10, v. 27

⁽¹⁰⁾††*Slant Manifesto* p. 12.

⁽¹¹⁾**Ibid.* p. 6.

made mistakes, I am prepared to accept: that the general consensus of opinion among these (and also laymen) should be wrong I find more difficult to believe. *But if we cannot put much faith in the common teaching of the Church, why should we believe in the infallibility of the New Left Catholics and accept their contention that only a socialist approach to social problems is really consistent with the teaching of Christ?*

Slant Critique of Capitalism

Even if we were to accept many of the *Slant* arguments about the social nature of Christianity, it would not follow that we need accept their criticisms of capitalism or neo-capitalism. The attack on capitalism rests on one fundamental argument, "the alienation, on the part of the worker, from the whole work-process in which he is involved, a process ultimately beyond his control"*⁽¹²⁾ Even if the work itself is creative, it is not wholly satisfying because the product "does not belong to him" but "becomes part of a system which is beyond him" but in which "he is passively caught up". Therefore the solution is workers' control of industry.

The real trouble with the analysis at this point is that it is carried out in terms of fine sounding philosophical nonsense and there is not the slightest attempt to analyse the actual working of the economic system as it is or as it might be. And again, the priorities are wrong. Work is primarily a means of satisfying human needs—material needs. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the earth."*⁽¹³⁾ Since the redemption, work may have become a means of "abolishing human alienation from nature" but it is so only in so far as it fulfils its primary function of satisfying man's material needs. It is essential, therefore, that any discussion of the desirability of socialism as opposed to any other kind of economic system must include an analysis of how these wants are indicated and how scarce productive resources are allocated to satisfying them. A market mechanism, is essential if it is to be possible for the

⁽¹²⁾**Ibid.* p. 17.

⁽¹³⁾*Genesis ch. 3, v. 19.

ordinary person to express his wants. The market mechanism is necessarily imperfect. It is easier for a person to express a negative opinion than a positive one. He can, in the last resort, refuse to buy any article that is offered for sale, but he cannot show that he wants something that is not offered for sale. He has to wait until some businessman anticipates his want before he can make his opinion known. In addition, wants are artificially manipulated by advertising, though too much can be made of this point.

The economic system of the U.S.S.R. is one example of socialism in action. In the Soviet economy, there has been a marked emphasis on centralised planning, with a remarkable disregard for the wishes of the ordinary consumer. There is, however, no reason why a measure of common ownership of the means of production should not be combined with reliance on the market mechanism as an indicator of human needs. There would certainly be better prospects of this if there were some kind of direct workers' control rather than state ownership of all productive resources.

Nevertheless, any system of workers' control would involve very great difficulties. Unless there is first the change of heart that traditional papal social teaching has called for, we would merely have the creation of a new system in which one set of conflicting interests was replaced by another. Workers' control would not of itself solve our present problems, nor has it been proved that a modification of our present system coupled with a real change of heart would not be more effective. Workers' control might well create difficulties that would be greater, in some directions, than those we encounter now. How would the problem of redundancy be tackled with workers' control? It is no answer to say that the creation of redundancy under the present system is wrong. It is wrong only in so far as redundancy can mean undue hardship for those affected. It would be equally wrong to decide that there should be no redundancy, as could be the case if workers decided they would accept short-time working. It is essential, from the viewpoint of the *whole* community, that the labour force should be re-deployed in the light of changing demands from consumers.

THE CHURCH AT WORK

LOVE IN ACTION: 3

Credit Unions in Developing Countries

J. VAN den DRIES

What are Credit Unions ?

In Father McCormack's book *Christian Responsibility and World Poverty*, a chapter is devoted to Credit Unions. Other names are "Raffeissen Bank", "Caisse d'économie" and "Credit Societies". The name "Raffeissen Bank" tells us that the idea or scheme was started in Germany in the 19th Century. The same words tell us that a Credit Union is a bank. A Credit Union is a co-operative which deals with money only (not with produce); this fact makes a Credit Union into a bank. But it is a bank owned and operated by the members, to whom alone all the profits may go. A Credit Union operates in the same way as an ordinary bank. To a bank you bring your savings (savings are production less consumption); you buy a share and you get a dividend; you deposit your savings and you get an interest. From a bank you take away money. It may be a simple withdrawal of your own savings. It may be a loan; on this loan you pay interest. In a Credit Union you pay usually 1 per cent per month on the unpaid balance. A Credit Union, being a bank, takes all precautions against loss which an ordinary bank takes. A Credit Union is a democratic society in which all decisions are taken by the members; in which all have equal rights; in which one man has only one vote, no matter how much money he has put into the Credit Union. A Credit Union is a non-political and non-denominational society. Therefore, all may join who have the common-bond decided upon, e.g. occupational (teachers), geographical

(all within a given area), or associational (all belonging to a trade union, a co-operative, etc., etc.).

It is not difficult to organise a Credit Union as it is the most simple and basic form of a co-operative. All education must start with the facts of life, with economics or proper use of money. But a good organiser is thorough and pays close attention to even the smallest details. You must take your time. You start teaching over a period of 6-8 months the FOUNDER GROUP of 6-9 persons. After that you call the Formational (CHARTER) MEETING which decides on registration. After another two months or so you call your ORGANISATIONAL (INAUGURAL or FIRST GENERAL) MEETING at which the Managing Committee is elected. Credit Unions are in the socio-economic field aiming to take away some causes of poverty. Therefore, it is the field par excellence for lay-people. The missionary (priest, brother, sister) should sponsor, encourage, stimulate, advise, warn, help organise but *he should never run the credit union nor provide the initial starting capital.*

World-wide Movement

It is little over a 100 years since Fredrich Wilhelm Raffeissen founded the first Raffeissen Bank in Germany. Mr. Alphonse Desjardins introduced the movement to Canada and Mr. Edward Filene to the United States. All of us know that when the Americans get hold of a sound idea and work on it, they make it big and large and wide. So it is no wonder that C.U.N.A. (the Credit Union National Association) embraces all Credit Unions in the U.S.A. and most of Canada and that to CUNA International are affiliated around 66 Credit Union Leagues representing about 30,000 Credit Unions with a membership of some 18 million persons and with total assets in the region of 10 billion dollar, (figures from International Credit Union Year Book 1964). If ever the saying "many small savings, make a large capital" was true, it certainly is true of the Credit Union movement.

Now in this world-wide growth of the movement Catholic priests, brothers and sisters have played a prominent part,

particularly in the developing countries over the last decade or so.

The Example of Peru

This is a rags-to-riches Credit Union success story for Peru, for it tops all other Latin American countries (over one thousand Credit Unions) in the number and size of its flourishing Credit Unions. It was only in 1955 that a Maryknoll priest, Father Daniel McLellan, organised the country's first small Credit Union with 23 members and 28 dollars in capital. From that start in the small mountain town of Pono in southern Peru, the idea caught fire and spread rapidly. By 1960 there were over 200 active Credit Unions in the country and most of them were among the poorest people so that a Credit Union is rightly called "the poor man's bank". Total membership at that time was 61,000 members. Between them, these 61,000 members had saved up to 1½ million pesos and had made loans to one another to the value of 5 million pesos. By that time the Federation of Credit Unions in Peru was granted a loan of one million dollars by the Social Progress Trust Fund of the U.S.A. for such purposes as improved houses in the villages, roads and sewage.

At the moment of writing Father Dan McLellan has organised more than 300 Credit Unions in Peru. To these the "Co-operative Bank" organised by the energetic priest offers security and financial aid. Father Dan McLellan will be the first to admit that the success of the movement in Peru is due to the numerous priests who at the local parish level organised Credit Unions. We cannot mention them all but we should mention Father Joseph Serjeant who as assistant in the parish organised the Our Lady of Pilar Parish Credit Union in Arequipa.

Another success story could be written about the *Co-operativa de Credito Nuestra Senora de Fatima at Iquitos*, organised by the Spanish Augustinian priest, Father David Araujo, so ably assisted by his parishioner Jorge Morey. In four years (1960-1964) the people in the slum parish of Iquitos, starting from scratch, have built a Credit Union

with 3,500 members with savings amounting to 750,000 dollars.

The Pacific Islands

One reason why missionaries back the Credit Union movement is to help their people to free themselves from the clutches of the loan-sharks or usurers. But Credit Unionism does much more than free people from usury. Modern society has unfortunately limited charity to almsgiving or some other form of remedial work. But true Christian charity or brotherly love expresses itself also in the economic life, in circumstances where a money economy has overtaken the barter system. In such modern circumstances easy credit is an act of justice and genuine Christian love. As an instance of such practical charity in modern circumstances, we might look at the work of Father Marion Ganey, first in British Honduras and later on the Fiji Islands. When he started out as a missionary in British Honduras Father Ganey soon discovered that usurers were charging exorbitant interest rates to people already far from being well off. Remembering *Rerum Novarum's* stress on mutual aid societies, he turned to the central office of Credit Unions in the United States for help. The first Credit Union was started in 1943. By the year 1953 he had established 19 Credit Unions among the Hondurans with 4,000 members and assets of over 500,000 dollars. So impressed was Sir Ronald Garvey, governor of British Honduras, that when he was transferred to the crown colony of the Fiji Islands, he invited Father Ganey to come and see what he could do to lessen the stranglehold which loansharks had on the population. To date Father Ganey has been responsible for the organisation of 236 Credit Unions containing 20,000 members. He has also extended his efforts to include British Samoa, the large island to the east of the Fijis.

The Example of Korea

South Korea has a flourishing Credit Union movement. The league is affiliated to C.U.N.A. International. When the League was officially established, 8,000 members gathered

in Seoul and were addressed by the Archbishop of Seoul. Again the movement owes its success to the energy and work of Sister Mary Gabriella Mulherin, a Maryknoll Sister in South Korea. Because of her efforts and the co-operation of the priests, catholics have played a very prominent role in the growth of the Credit Union movement in Korea. The majority of the Credit Unions were started by catholics in that country. Sister Gabriella now is the Principal of the Credit Union Training Centre in Korea. Is this good Sister not doing real missionary work, though she may not have baptised an infant in danger of death or not have taught the children catechism ?

The Example of the Philippine Islands

Recently (20th October-11th November, 1965) the second Asian Regional Credit Union Training Conference was organised by CUNA at Bangkok, Thailand. Three delegates from the Philippines came to this conference which was attended by 42 delegates from 7 Asian countries. The Credit Union officials of the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement presented graphic evidence of what Credit Unions can do for a rural population. Priests and sisters of various nationalities have encouraged and stimulated the Credit Union movement in the islands.

The Example of Hongkong

Seven delegates from Hongkong attended the Bangkok Conference. The delegation was headed by Rev. John Collins, S.J., Director of the Voluntary Credit Union Centre of Hongkong and Mr. Andrew So, the assistant director of the same centre. Father Collins has served as educator, spiritual leader and pioneered in translating the manuals in the English language into simplified Chinese versions.

The Example of Taiwan

Responsible for much of the interest in Credit Unions as a tool for the economic betterment of Asian people is SELA (Socio-economic Life in Asia) with headquarters in Hongking. The Jesuit priests are responsible for this, particularly

Father Albert O'Hara, S.J., professor of sociology at National Taiwan University. SELA's Taiwan affiliate is the Association of Socio-Economic Development in China (ASEDC). Its executive Secretary is Father Francis X. Chang, S.J., Ph.D., who is Dean of Studies, College of Law, and professor of sociology at Fu Yen University. He also supervises the functions of the Voluntary Credit Union centre, Taiwan; he is ably assisted by Mr. John Mou.

Father Yves Brena, S.J., established three parish Credit Unions in Hsinchu since the 1st August, 1964. Now efforts have been turned to aborigine villagers around Nan-ao and Mei-Hsi. These villages can be described as typical backward communities in which poverty, ignorance, resignation to fate and lack of foresight constitute one complex and seemingly insoluble problem. The villagers pay as much as 20 per cent per month on loans from the merchants. They spend a lot of money on wine and tobacco. Maternity and medical care are virtually non-existent. Few children complete school, if there is a school. To a people facing conditions such as these Father Chang said: "Handouts can only bring temporary relief, not permanent solution. The people themselves have to be reformed and transformed first. The best way is to teach and help people to help themselves: by developing their self-reliance, self-confidence, spirit of co-operation and service, and basic skills in handling money and economic affairs". To cut a long story short, after a three day training programme in February, 1965, conducted by Fathers Chang, O'Hara, and Mr. Mou, the founder group went to work. On May 30th, 1965, the Nan-ao Credit Union was formally inaugurated with 92 members and 100 dollars in savings. On September 26th, 1965, the Mei-Hsi Credit Union was started by Father Richard Devoe, M.M., with 1,000 dollars in savings which have risen to 1,800 dollars by early 1966. Now the villagers drink less and their most popular password now is: "Save more". Taiwan now counts 10 Credit Unions and 23 more are in the process of formation.

Book Review

Philosophy With Compassion

Belief and Unbelief by Michael Novak; Darton, Longman & Todd. 30s.

SOME Christians are like the Jews as John Courtney Murray describes them in *The Problem of God*—their theology is the amassing of experience that they live under God's providence and that God is indeed God-with-us. They have no need to bolster their faith with argument about God's existence: when you are in intimate converse with someone, you do not make him the object of a Missing-Person investigation.

Security such as that is comparatively rare nowadays. Believers may have no doubts of their own, but they cannot be unaware of the doubts and denials of others which are broadcast by all our marvellous means of communication. The believer should want to make what he considers to be truth available for the doubter, but he must find an acceptable way of transmitting it. His private experience is not received as a demonstration of God's existence. He must, therefore, join the doubter in his questioning.

Many other Christians have already joined the doubter on their own account. They have faith, but they have doubts as well. At the time, in early adolescence, when they become interested in fashions for clothes and hair-dos, they find that belief is unfashionable. They begin to wonder if it is right for them to suffer the indignity of being pitied for intellectual dowdiness. Are they really backward? Have they been indoctrinated with myths and fairy-stories? Nobody informed them in their early education that the basic propositions of their religion were contradicted by half the world. They discover now that the possibility of choice was kept hidden from them so that they could not make it. Is it not time that they began to think for themselves?

Indeed it is ! And they might well start with *Belief and Unbelief*.

They will find that thinking for themselves is hard work, especially if their mind has been made indolent by a pedagogy which gives answers without first evoking questions. They will have to travel laboriously back from conclusions to premises, testing each step for soundness: and not only their own conclusions, as that God exists, Christ is God, the Church is his foundation, but also those of unbelievers. They may fear that their theism is not demonstrably intelligent; but they should not at once conclude that atheism and agnosticism must therefore be reasonable. Much of the unbelief they will come across is no more than a thin seepage from the heights where philosophical unbelief is systematised; and it should be examined as closely as the results of their own indoctrination.

The examination, whatever doctrine it starts with, leads back to the same point—the point at which the human being asks his first question.

It is by asking questions that we learn. Questioning is the inevitable activity of what Bernard Lonergan, in *Insight* calls our “pure, detached, disinterested, unrestricted desire to know”. But the first question does not arise inevitably, the same for everyone. All questions “assume a certain view on what it is to know, and a certain concept of the human person”. The ultimate conclusions of the philosophies are already implicit in the assumptions behind the first questions which the philosophies pose. “A philosopher decides what he thinks human knowing is, and thus defines a vision of man, man’s aims, and the attitudes fruitful for man to take”. That is true of empiricism, logical positivism, and the method of enquiry—“scientific method”—thought to be objective and free from all assumptions.

Michael Novak begins with the assumptions that philosophy must make. He weighs belief against unbelief by testing them for humaneness. Which has the more acceptable view of human nature? Which is the better suited to human beings? Which makes life more livable? Which gives the more satisfactory answers to the questions which man can-

not avoid asking — what is he? is he a who, as well as a what? is he responsible beyond himself? beyond other human beings? The questions are still asked, as they have been asked for centuries; but here they have to be asked within a reality which the author calls "intelligent subjectivity". The thinker—the reader of the book, for example—has to savour himself thinking, to experience his own reflectiveness from within, rather than to stand outside it to reflect on it. In that intensely personal self-consciousness he progresses from his first awareness of self to an ever closer following of the advice of Socrates: Know thyself. In that progress, "there are four experiences of the human person that seem especially important in the quest for one's own identity. These are the experiences of the activities of awareness, insight, reflective judgment and the drive to understand".

Is God real? That is a question that everyone must ask who responds to the drive to understand. God "is before the beginning of every question, and he remains after every answer". The insatiable human mind seeks an absolute, an infinite where questions must rest because they cannot exhaust it. Is God the absolute?

Michael Novak fights his way forward from one answer to the next question, aware at each step of all the different assumptions and of the believing and unbelieving conclusions to which they lead. He is sensitive all the while to the human problems, and he writes philosophy with compassion.

His aim being to keep in company with all seekers after truth, he tries to abstract from what he may know by faith, and to proceed from one partial answer to the next on the way to an unknown destination. Trusting his reason, he arrives at a natural belief which is not inconsistent with the faith accepted from God. He seems at times to go too far out of his direct way in his anxiety not to lose sight of unbelievers; and some of his thinking about God seems to have an emotional tinge of pessimism. In the main, however, his exercise of reason in the philosophy of belief is admirably done.

William Lawson, S.J.